

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claim 2 was cancelled in a previous amendment and remains cancelled. In the Office Action of November 7, 2008, claims 1-5 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 3 are amended.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa et al.* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026) ("*Ishikawa*") in view of *Ono et al.* (JP 2000-289320) ("*Ono*") and *George et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,487,122) ("*George*"), *Yakazama et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,420,200), *Schell* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,098,546) ("*Schell*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 now recites that the length of the gravure roll is substantially the same as the length of the silicon blanket, the tapered portion of the gravure roll is located over a non-pixel forming area, and the tapered portion of the gravure roll is located over a non-pixel forming area such that excess coating film on the pixel forming area under the untapered portion of the gravure roll is transferred into the non-pixel area.

This is clearly unlike, *Ishikawa*, which fails to disclose the length of the gravure roll is substantially the same as the length of the silicon blanket, the tapered portion of the gravure roll is located over a non-pixel forming area, and the tapered portion of the gravure roll is located over a non-pixel forming area such that excess coating film on the pixel forming area under the untapered portion of the gravure roll is pushed into the non-pixel area. Instead, *Ishikawa* discloses a blanket cylinder on a silicone blanket without tapered ends or the length defined relative to the silicon blanket length. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0001026, Para [0037].

As the Examiner states in the May 23, 2008 Office Action, *Ono* fails to disclose a gravure roll with tapered edges.

*George*, relates to a press system which uses a flexible depression compensating impression roll to apply a constant pressure to a press. See, U.S. Pat. No. 4,487,122, Col 3, l. 61-68. Further, *George* discloses a gravure roll with rounded edges which is longer than the impression roll on which it sits with tapered ends used to fit into roller bearings. See, U.S. Patent No. 4,487,122, Col. 6, l.1-19; Fig. 1. In addition, because the tapered ends disclosed in *George* are placed inside a roller bearing, they would not allow excess material from a pixel area to be pushed into a non-pixel area. See, U.S. Pat Office Action 4,487,122, Fig. 1.

*Yamazaki* or *Schell* do not disclose or even suggest anything pertaining to the tapered portion of a gravure roll being located over a non-pixel forming area and the length of the gravure roll being substantially equal to the length of the silicon blanket. Instead, *Yamazaki* and *Schell* both disclose a straight cylinder without tapered ends. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,420,200, Fig 1B; U.S. Pat. No. 6,098,546 Fig 1.

As the applicant's specification discloses, by providing the tapered portion of a gravure roll located over a non-pixel forming area and the length of the gravure roll being substantially equal to the length of a silicon blanket, the non uniformity of the layer width of the contacted liquid portion is absorbed by the non-pixel forming area resulting in a small and uniform coating film on the silicone blanket. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para [0051]. Since

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono*, *George* and any combination of them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 1, the rejection cannot stand.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Ono* and in further view of *Yakazama*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 3 recites forming at least one organic layer created by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of the silicone blanket such that excess coating film located under the relief printing plate is transferred to the non pixel area and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket and excess coating film is transferred from the pixel area to the non pixel area.

As the Examiner states in the November 7, 2008, Office Action, *Ishakawa* does not disclose that ink is supplied on to a silicon blanket via a slit made of two flat plates.

In the Office Action of November 7, 2008, the Examiner states that *Ono* does not explicitly teach a “slant surfaces with a downward gradient” In addition, the Examiner alleges that “using rounded edges would reduce sharp edges which could cause injury” and it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the dye coater of *Ono* with rounded edges. However, the applicant is not claiming “rounded” edges, the applicant is claiming “slant surfaces with a downward gradient.” The use of a “slant surfaces with a downward gradient” allows for the transfer of excess coating material from the pixel area to the non pixel area.

As the Applicant’s specification discloses, by forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided

in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket, the non uniformity of the layer width of the contacted liquid portion is absorbed by the non-pixel forming area resulting in a small and uniform coating film on the silicone blanket. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0202778, Para [0075].

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono* and any combination of the them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 3, the rejection cannot stand. Because claim 4 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3, it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Ono* and in further view of *Suga* (U.S. Patent No. 5,853,801) ("*Suga*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As stated above, claim 3 is patentable over *Ishikawa* and *Ono*.

*Suga*, similarly, fails to disclose forming at least one organic layer by supplying a coating liquid onto a silicone blanket from the bottom side thereof via a slit provided in parallel to the rotational axis of a silicone blanket where the top faces of the two flat plates are slant surfaces with a downward gradient from the central portion side toward the end portion sides of the rotational axis of the silicone blanket and the slant surfaces correspond to non-pixel forming areas of the silicone blanket. Instead, *Suga* discloses a wire bar supported at both ends by bearings and coating of the wire bar using coating wells. See, U.S. Patent No. 5,853,801, Col. 12, l. 63-Col. 13, l. 1-20.

Therefore, because *Ishikawa*, *Ono*, *Suga* and any combination of the them fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claim 3, the rejection cannot stand. Because

claim 5 depends, either directly or indirectly, from claim 3, it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2009

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000